

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 14, 16 to 18, and 20 to 26 are pending and being considered in the present application. Claim 19 has been canceled. Claims 14, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25, and 26 have been amended. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper, and cited references, dated April 2, 2008.

II. Rejection of Claims 14, 16 to 20, and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 14, 16 to 20, and 26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2001-119451 (“Krueger”).

In order for a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single prior art reference must disclose each and every element of the claim in exactly the same way. *Lindeman Maschinenfabrik v. Am. Hoist and Derrick*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1984); MPEP §2131.

As an initial matter, claim 19 has been canceled herein without prejudice thereby rendering moot the present rejection as applied to claim 19.

Claim 14, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, “at least one service uses at least one output medium, including at least one visual output medium that includes at least two display adaptations of one service . . . and performing a speed-dependent adaptation of the visual output medium.” Nothing in any of the prior art references disclose or suggest this feature. Though Krueger may generally disclose devices that might have visual displays (e.g., cell phone, radio, navigation), nowhere is an adaptation of the visual output medium disclosed. Krueger may also generally disclose disabling a service (which may include a visual output), but the disabling of a visual output medium does not disclose or even suggest “adapting” a visual output medium.

For at least this reason, Krueger does not disclose, or even suggest all of the features of claim 14, so that Krueger does not anticipate claim 14.

Claims 16 to 18, and 20 depend from claim 14 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 14. Accordingly, Krueger does not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the same reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 14.

Separately and independently, claim 17 should be allowed because Krueger does not disclose “wherein at least one service uses at least two input mediums, the method further comprising: performing a speed-dependent selection from among the at least two input mediums for an operator control of the at least one service.” Krueger may generally disclose devices that might have two input mediums, but does not disclose a speed-dependent selection from among those input mediums for a single service. For this additional reason, Krueger does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 17, so that Krueger does not anticipate claim 17.

Separately and independently, claim 18 should be allowed because Krueger does not disclose “wherein at least one service uses at least two output mediums, the method further comprising: performing a speed-dependent selection from among the at least two output mediums for a representation of the at least one service.” Krueger may generally disclose devices that might have two output mediums, but does not disclose a speed-dependent selection from among those output mediums for a single service. For this additional reason, Krueger does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 18, so that Krueger does not anticipate claim 18.

Claim 26 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 14, so that Krueger does not anticipate claim 26 for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 14.

Withdrawal of this anticipation rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claim 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krueger in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,072 (“Yamanaka”).

Claim 21 depends from claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14 since Yamanaka does not, and is not asserted to, cure the deficiencies of Krueger noted above with regard to claim 14.

Separately and independently, claim 21 should be allowed because neither Krueger nor Yamanaka disclose any of the enumerated features of claim 21 of “a) changing a character display size on the output medium, b) replacing text with graphical information, and c) providing a controlled selection of advertisements as a function of the speed.” None

of the references disclose these features with respect to “adapting an output medium in a manner controlled by a speed.” For this additional reason, Krueger in view of Yamanaka do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 21, so that Krueger in view of Yamanaka do not render claim 21 unpatentable.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claim 22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krueger in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,126,583 (“Breed”).

Claim 22 ultimately depends from claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14 since Breed does not, and is not asserted to, cure the deficiencies of Krueger noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krueger in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 60-61923 (“Toshio”).

Claim 23 depends from claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14, since Toshio does not, and is not asserted to, cure the deficiencies of Krueger noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claim 24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krueger in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,973,333 (“O’Neil”).

Claim 24 depends from claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14 since O’Neil does not, and is not asserted to, cure the deficiencies of Krueger noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claim 25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krueger in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,667,726 ("Damiani").

Claim 25 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 14 since Damiani does not cure, and is not cited to cure, the deficiencies of Krueger noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Aaron Grunberger/

Dated: September 10, 2008

By: Aaron Grunberger (Reg. No. 59,210) for:
Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646